



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

of facts and conclusions. The result is that the work is hardly detailed enough for a college course, although of suggestive value to students at that stage. For students in secondary schools, on the other hand, the author has succeeded in presenting so much, in so compact a form and with so many historical allusions, that to make its use profitable there should be a thorough preparation in general history.

In execution the author has been very successful. The parts are well balanced. A few generalizations are open to contradiction, a few more to question, but on the whole the work shows a good grasp of the historical movements in the various periods. In his analysis of the essential features of the industrial and commercial life of the last period the author is not so fortunate. The style is smooth and the ideas clearly presented. There is a good index and good bibliographical reference-lists. The eighteen maps are very helpful; ten more, in place of the illustrations of vessels of the various periods, would have helped the text so much the more.

Dr. Webster's work will be found to be a very suggestive companion book for students of political and of industrial history; and in those institutions in which the work is all commercial, in which there are no courses in general history, and in which something is needed to fill this place, this work is the best that has yet been published.

H. S. PERSON.

*A History of Egypt.* By E. A. W. BUDGE. (Oxford: University Press; New York: Henry Frowde. 1902. Eight volumes. Pp. xxiv, 222; xvi, 207; xvi, 219; xvi, 241; xvi, 219; xxxiv, 230; xvi, 251; xvi, 321.)

RESEARCH in the field of Egyptian history can hardly be said to have kept pace with the rapid progress made in the study of the language in the last twenty years. The career of the Nile valley peoples in its principal epochs and broad outlines may now be traced with a fair degree of clearness, but the whole subject abounds in unsettled problems which require to solve them only the collection of the existent materials, and bristles with innumerable questions demanding special investigation. The very bulk of the history under review would suggest that at least some of this work had been done in its preparation, but such is not the case. The author frequently attempts the solution of the more patent problems, but he is for the most part unconscious of their existence. Why his researches are not more successful will be apparent as we proceed.

The work covers the entire sweep of Egyptian history from the earliest times to the absorption of the country into the Roman Empire. The division into volumes is not well done: the twenty-sixth dynasty is needlessly cut in two at the end of Volume VI., and the Ptolemies suffer the same fate at the end of Volume VII. The method of treatment is a modification of the one introduced by Brugsch and Wiedemann in Germany and followed by Petrie in England. It consists of presenting the

documentary and monumental sources themselves, arrayed before the reader in motley succession, accompanied by some few interpretative remarks by the author. That this is not history but merely the materials for a history is of course evident. The obvious function of the historian, of sifting, classifying, arranging, and then basing a coherent and carefully digested treatment of each epoch upon these sources, plays no part in such a work. There is an attempt to avoid this difficulty in the present work by appending to each period that has been so treated a summary. If these summaries had been skilfully done and put together in a volume by themselves, the whole work would have been much improved. As it is, it suffers from repetition. As each volume is introduced by a preface summarizing its content, the repetition becomes intolerable, especially as repetitiousness is characteristic of the author. For example, he says, "In this coffin was found a mummy which was believed to be that of the queen, but when it was opened on June 27th, 1886, the inscriptions which were found upon the bandages, etc., showed that it was the mummy of king Painetchem" (III. 200, 201). Only six pages further on (not in the summary) he says, "The mummy which was inside the coffin of queen Aah-hetep was opened on June 27, 1886, and the inscriptions on the bandages proved that it was the mummy of Painetchem." Again in successive sentences: ". . . at Elephantine he built a small but most interesting temple in honor of Khnemu, the Nubian god of the first cataract. This building was comparatively small . . ." (IV. 110). A number of similar examples might be offered.

As to the character of the sources, in the form presented by the author, several facts should be noted. The classic sources are not cited in the best and the latest translations; indeed (to use the author's own words), "The extracts from the History of Herodotus, given in English, are taken from the quaint and charming old rendering of the first two books by 'B. R.,' which was published in 1584"!! Page after page of this "quaint and charming old rendering," with the old English spelling unchanged, and in critical passages bristling with errors that make it worthless, are then offered for the reader's delectation. The Egyptian sources are given in translations or in summaries and occasionally in the original. The most difficult and uncertain passages are rendered in the smoothest of modern English, without a hint of an interrogation point. The Egyptian sources are therefore far more untrustworthy than the classic. Of the philological side of the work we shall have occasion to speak further.

It is impossible within the necessary limits of a review to discuss the large and difficult question of the chronology. The author adopts with some modification the system of Brugsch, without seeming to know that Brugsch later accepted without reservation the astronomical results of Mahler — results which the author rejects after the most superficial examination, and results which make quite impossible his own system.

The vast period covered by the work, as well as the amount of material involved, make it quite impossible to survey the author's treatment of the

successive epochs with which he deals. All that we can do is to examine the character of his methods and results, and determine whether or not his work is trustworthy. We have already noted that the repetitions in the work indicate a tendency to forget entirely what he has already stated. But this tendency does not stop at repetition; it goes on to contradict calmly, in a manner that is simply amazing, what has already been dogmatically stated in previous pages. Permit me to offer a few examples:

1. In speaking of the stela between the fore legs of the Great Sphinx, the author says, "In the thirteenth line of the inscription, the cartouche of Khaf-Ra occurs, but the text is too mutilated to see in what exact connection" (II. 50). Later he states, ". . . the few legible words in line 14 tell us that the Sphinx was made by king Khaf-Ra" (IV. 86). The first statement is correct; the second, contradicting it, is pure fiction.

2. Referring to the wooden coffin found in the third pyramid of Gizeh, the author says: "So far back as 1883 . . . certain Egyptologists had declared the wooden coffin of Men-kau-Ra to be a 'restoration' of the XXVIth Dynasty, and not an original piece of work of the IVth Dynasty. . . . The statements put forth in support of the restoration theory are inconclusive and quite insufficient to set aside the opinion of the experienced archæologists [Birch and Maspero] mentioned above" (II. 60-61). Now this alleged fourth-dynasty coffin is mummiform and had a mummy's face and head. But later in arguing on the age of the coffins of the "Antef kings," the author says, ". . . no example of a coffin made in the shape of a mummy with a human face is known to belong to these early periods" (II. 182). As he is referring to the eleventh dynasty and earlier, the above mummiform coffin, affirmed by him to belong to the fourth dynasty, is here by his own admission necessarily of later date than the eleventh dynasty.

3. In speaking of the last Montuhotep, a Theban Pharaoh of the eleventh dynasty, the author says, ". . . before his death his empire extended from the sea coast on the north to a point some considerable distance to the south of Aswan" (II. 202); but a few pages further on, in the first paragraph of the very next volume, he remarks of the Theban Amenemhet I. (who reigned two generations later), ". . . he was the first of the princes of Thebes who succeeded in making himself actually king of the Nile Valley from the Mediterranean Sea to Aswan" (III. 1).

4. The British Museum possesses a pair of magnificent sculptured lions placed in the Nubian temple at Soleb by Amenhotep III.; they were later carried southward to Gebel Barkal in Nubia by one of the Nubian kings. Of these lions the author says that they "are thought by some to have been taken there [to Gebel Barkal] from the north by the king who usurped them, but that seems unlikely" (IV. 112). Later, however, he states: "It is usually said that Amenhetep III. set up here just under the mountain called Gebel Barkal, a building . . . , but there is no evidence that he did so, for the lions inscribed with his name . . .

which were found there were probably brought to that site from the temple at Soleb" (VI. 100).

5. The discussion of the remarkable reign of Amenhotep IV. calls out the following remark: "The mummy of Amenhetep IV. was found in the tomb of Amenhetep II. at Der al-Bahari" (IV. 129). A list of the royal mummies found in this tomb is later inserted, and it contains the name "Amenhetep IV." (IV. 175). In the face of all this we find in the next volume a page and a half devoted to a demonstration that M. Loret was wrong in asserting that among the royal mummies found by him in the tomb of Amenhotep II. was that of Amenhotep IV.; and the author adds that in January, 1900, he himself inspected the mummy alleged to be that of Amenhotep IV. and reached the conclusion that his colleagues were correct in asserting that it was not such, but that it belonged to Merneptah, supposed to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The two volumes containing these contradictory statements bear the year 1902 on the title-page as do all the volumes of the work.

Where unfamiliarity with what has already been said in the author's own work is so evident, acquaintance with what other men have said or with the evidence of the monuments is hardly to be expected. Of some of the most important monuments the work shows total ignorance. One of the important activities of Egypt's earliest period was her commerce with Punt (the Somali coast) by the Red Sea route. A very interesting inscription in a tomb at Assuan contains the autobiography of a nobleman named Pepinakht, who relates how he was sent to the Red Sea coast to rescue and bring back the body of an officer who, while building a ship there for a voyage to Punt, had been set upon and killed by the Beduin of the region. Not knowing of this inscription, nor of another at Assuan showing that at least two more voyages to Punt were made in the Old Kingdom, the author tortures the reference to the only expedition thither with which he is acquainted in this period into an overland route to Punt, for which there is not the slightest evidence (II. 120, 134). These four voyages took place in the fifth and sixth dynasties, in the middle of the third millennium before Christ, and are the earliest long voyages in the open sea known in human history; but our author knows of no voyage to Punt until the eleventh dynasty (II. 206), nor of any "sea-going boats" earlier than the same period (VI. 59). The family of nobles who carried on this commerce for the Pharaohs of the time resided at Assuan, on the island of Elephantine at the foot of the first cataract. In one of the neighboring cliffs their tomb chapels are hewn, and it is in these chapels that they have left the records of their adventurous voyages. They naturally also led the Pharaoh's caravans into the upper cataract region to trade among the Nubian tribes for ebony, ivory, gold, and panther-skins. The most famous of these border nobles was Hirkhuf, who penetrated to the pygmies of the interior and brought back one of them for the Pharaoh. After recounting this man's expeditions, the author says, "It is much to be hoped that other inscriptions of the kind may be forthcoming" (II. 120). Considering the fact that the

author has visited and written at length upon the Assuan tombs (PSBA X. 4-40) and even assisted in their excavation, it is remarkable that he should be unacquainted with the content of the inscriptions in the tomb of Sabni (of which he himself took squeezes on his visit there), which furnish us with another expedition like that of Hirkhuf. Had the author made use of his own squeezes, the desired "other inscriptions of the kind" might have been "forthcoming." In the Old Kingdom, for a knowledge of which our sources are so painfully scanty, we therefore find that, in the matter of foreign relations alone, three important inscriptions, two of them long ones, are unknown to the author. Again, in the foreign relations of the Middle Kingdom, the expedition of Useratesen I. against the Beduin is unmentioned and seems to be unknown. Likewise the treatment of the foreign relations of the New Kingdom suffers from similar unfamiliarity with the existing evidence. The queen "Thi," who, in the opinion of our author, was a foreign princess from Mitanni, and is so often mentioned on the interesting commemorative scarabs of Amenhotep III., is already mentioned on the great Bull-hunt scarab in the king's second year. But with this important monument the author is unacquainted, and he spends nearly two pages (IV. 98-100) on the question of the date of the queen's marriage, a question which would not have arisen if he had been acquainted with this scarab. The sources on the foreign connections of the New Kingdom contain monument after monument thus overlooked by the author. Thus the campaign of Amasis I. into Phœnicia is unknown to him (III. 188); he is unacquainted with the campaign of Thutmose II. on the Euphrates (III. 215); he has overlooked the advance of Thutmose III. to Lebanon on his first campaign after the fall of Megiddo (IV. 36, 37). \* Such are some of the more important oversights bearing on foreign relations alone. But the worst sin of this character in the work is in the treatment of the eleventh dynasty. A group of Pharaohs named Intef or Antef, usually assigned to this dynasty, have been shown by Steindorff to belong, *with some exceptions*, to the seventeenth dynasty, some four hundred years later. Our author, using Steindorff's results (without acknowledgment, by the way), is so captivated with the idea of the later date for these kings that he overlooks the exceptions, and bundles the whole group unceremoniously into the seventeenth dynasty. Yet the tombstone of a man who lived early in the twelfth dynasty records the fact that he held an office to which his great-grandfather before him had been appointed by one of the Antefs, called Uah-ankh. This "Uah-ankh," therefore, must of course have lived before the twelfth dynasty; but not knowing of this tombstone, which is in the museum of Leyden (V. 3; Piehl Insc. III. XXI.-XXII.), our author carries Antef-"Uah-ankh" also over to the seventeenth dynasty!

The above omissions concern only original documents; it would be useless to cite examples of unfamiliarity with the researches of the last twenty years. Even the time-honored "poet laureate of the day," Pentaure, who was buried with honors by Erman twenty years ago, still

figures in a musty paragraph of this work (VI. 52). Where a modern work is cited and apparently used by the author, a closer examination reveals that his acquaintance with it does not extend beyond the title. Thus he refers to Schaefer's new edition of the great Nastesen Stela in Berlin, but in his use of the monument he employs the mention of Don-gola (VIII. 157), formerly supposed (by Maspero) to be found upon it, not knowing that the cleaning of the stone and the new collation by Schaefer have shown that no such word exists in the text. But the vast majority of the results of recent research, except those gained by excavation, have no place in the work whatever.

Turning from the material which the author has overlooked to that which he has employed, the misunderstandings and errors are numerous, far exceeding the slips of which every historian must now and again be guilty. We are told that the obelisk of Hatshepsut at Thebes weighs 3,650 tons (IV. 18), which is about ten times its actual weight; and the fact that such numbers are found in the old guide-books inclines one to think that it is not a misprint here. It is stated that the Lateran obelisk gives the length of time between the reigns of Thutmose III. and Thutmose IV. as 35 years (IV. 60), whereas it only states that it had been *lying on the ground* as left by Thutmose III. for 35 years until it was erected by Thutmose IV. We find Amenhotep III. referred to as the son of Amenhotep II. (IV. 161), though he was in reality his grandson; we see Thutmose IV. making an expedition to Phœnicia on the basis of an inscription of the reign of his grandfather, Thutmose III. (IV. 79); while Ramses III. is made to fight a great naval battle on the coast of Palestine, although the inscriptions clearly state that it took place in Phœnicia (V. 152). This list might be continued indefinitely; and to these errors of the author's own making might be added a long list of those which he has taken over from the work of other men, some of which clearly earmark the secondary sources which he has used, like the list of dead and captured in Ramses III.'s second Libyan war (V. 157), which contains a mistake in the numbers to be found only in Chabas's translation (and in Maspero's *Histoire*, from the same source).

From what has been said it will be evident that this work has been put together with a haste which has made careful work and safe results an impossibility. Almost every page bears evidence of a looseness that is fatal to the results. The great copper statue of King Pepi appears at first as of copper, but regularly after that as of bronze; of the ships of Queen Hatshepsut on their return up the Red Sea from the Somali coast, the author says, "In due course the ships arrived at Thebes . . ." (IV. 10). What ships? There was no water connection between the Nile and the Red Sea at this time. When such looseness is found in the treatment of purely material things, the reader may imagine what happens when the author treats abstract questions demanding something of historic sympathy and an appreciation of historical and race psychology. Hence we find the Nubian conqueror Piankhi, when he was unable to catch a certain clever Delta prince and force him to surrender,

innocently eulogized in this delicious fashion: “. . . it was a generous act on the part of the Nubian conqueror to spare him such a terrible humiliation in the sight of his former allies . . .” (IV. 114).

The question of transliteration, being exclusively philological, cannot be treated in this REVIEW, but the general observation should certainly be made that the old misreadings scattered through this work are very numerous, besides many of the author's own making, like the absurd miswriting of the name of Amenhotep IV. both in hieroglyphic and transliteration (IV. 118). But the reader can best judge of these if he notes that the Tanite king, known to the Greeks as Smendes, appears in this work as “Nes-ba-Tetet,” “Nes-ba-neb-Tet,” “Ba-neb-Tet,” and “Nes-ba-Tet” (VI. 1, 4, 7); and the Egyptian name of Cambyses is now “Ra-mesuth” and again “Mesthu-Ra” (VII. 42, 45); although there is but one correct form for each of these two names.

The English of the work, like the method employed, is loose. I cannot forbear quoting a remarkable passage regarding the inscription set up at the southern boundary of Egypt by Userthesen III.: “It prohibited every negro from passing that spot, whether by sailing down the river or marching along its banks, as well as the passage of all oxen and sheep and goats and asses, except such as were engaged in the traffic in cattle, and such as had need to come to Egypt for the purposes of barter and of business generally” (III. 36-37).

The work is very fully illustrated, presenting many unpublished monuments, some of them of great importance. For the publication of this material every student of Egyptian civilization will be grateful to the author. The monuments of the earliest dynastic as well as of the predynastic period from the rich collections of the British Museum, thus made accessible to the public, are especially valuable. The statue of Apet (II. 5), dated by the author in the archaic period, is a forgery and was made for one of the mudirs of Upper Egypt.

While severe strictures upon the author's method have been necessary, there are respects in which the work will prove very useful. The account of the successive excavations which have brought us our knowledge of the earliest dynasties; the attempt to furnish a complete list of all known royal names; the insertion of Moslem sources on the former state of the monuments; and the full citation of classic sources, where a proper translation has been employed, all these will be very convenient for ready reference. It is much to be regretted that the service rendered by the author in these particulars should be obscured by the defects to which so much attention has so unavoidably been given above. Finally it should be added that the typography of the volumes is good and that misprints are rare.

*The House of Seleucus.* By EDWYN ROBERT BEVAN, M.A. (London: Edward Arnold; New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1902. Two vols. Pp. xii, 330; viii, 333.)

OF making many Greek histories — *in usum scholarum* — there is no end. The beaten track is become a very boulevard from the Plain of Troy